



**Before the  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF CALIFORNIA  
San Francisco, California 94102**

Application of the North American Numbering  
Plan Administrator, on behalf of the California  
Telecommunications Industry, for Relief of the  
760 Numbering Plan Area

Docket No. A0706018

**APPLICATION OF THE NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING PLAN  
ADMINISTRATOR, ON BEHALF OF THE CALIFORNIA TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
INDUSTRY, FOR RELIEF OF THE 760 NUMBERING PLAN AREA**

NeuStar, Inc., the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (“NANPA”), in its role as the neutral third party NPA Relief Planner for California under the North American Numbering Plan and on behalf of the California telecommunications industry (“Industry”),<sup>1</sup> requests that the Public Utilities Commission of California (“Commission”)<sup>2</sup> approve the Industry’s consensus<sup>3</sup> decision to recommend to the Commission an all-services distributed overlay as the preferred form of relief for the 760 numbering plan area (“NPA”).<sup>4</sup> The Industry also reached consensus to recommend a two-way geographic split, described as Alternative #4 below, if the Commission decides to adopt a geographic split rather than the recommended

<sup>1</sup> The Industry is composed of current and prospective telecommunications carriers operating in, or considering operations within, the 760 area code in California.

<sup>2</sup> The Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) delegated authority to the states, including California, to review and approve NPA relief plans. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 52.19.

<sup>3</sup> Consensus as used in this document means: Consensus is established when substantial agreement has been reached among those participating in the issue at hand. Substantial agreement means more than a simple majority, but not necessarily unanimous agreement. (ATIS Operating Procedures, section 7.1, version 4.0, January 3, 2006 (see Exhibit A, page 4).

<sup>4</sup> As the neutral third party administrator, NANPA has no independent view regarding the relief option selected by the Industry.

overlay. The Industry submits its recommendation to the Commission based upon NANPA's projections that absent NPA relief, the supply of central office codes (often referred to as "CO" or "NXX" codes) for the 760 NPA will exhaust during the third quarter of 2009. In order to allow sufficient time for completion of the selected relief plans prior to exhaust of CO codes in the 760 NPA, the Industry requests that the Commission also approve the recommended 13-month implementation schedule if the Commission adopts the overlay alternative or the recommended 15-month implementation schedule if the Commission adopts a geographic split alternative. In support of this application and on behalf of the Industry, NANPA submits the following:

## **I. BACKGROUND**

### **A. Prior 760 NPA Relief Efforts**

Due to the high demand for diminishing numbering resources, NANPA originally completed a relief planning process for the 760 NPA in 1998 and the Industry's recommended relief plan was submitted to the Commission on March 16, 1999. The Commission received comments from the telecommunications industry, local government agencies and citizens regarding the proposed relief plans and ultimately issued an order on July 8, 1999 approving a two-way geographic split for the 760 NPA.<sup>5</sup> The Commission subsequently suspended and deferred implementation of the approved relief plan in order to explore, develop and employ more efficient means of using numbering resources to extend the life of the 760 NPA.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> See Opinion, Decision No. 99-07-017, Rulemaking No. 95-04-043, Investigation No. 95-04-044 (July 8, 1999).

<sup>6</sup> See Opinion, Decision No. 00-07-053, Rulemaking No. 95-04-043, Investigation No. 95-04-044 (July 20, 2000).

## **B. Current 760 NPA Relief Efforts**

The April 2007 NRUF (Number Resource Utilization Forecast) and NPA Exhaust Analysis (“2007 NRUF Report”) indicates that the 760 NPA will exhaust during the third quarter of 2009.<sup>7</sup> This projection is based upon the current jeopardy rationing of CO code assignments at two per month for the 760 NPA.<sup>8</sup> Based upon the projected exhaust of the 760 NPA and the belief that the previous relief plan approved in 1999 was out of date, the Commission requested that NANPA convene an Industry relief meeting to develop new alternatives to address relief for the 760 NPA.<sup>9</sup> On September 15, 2006 NANPA notified the Industry that the first relief meeting would be held October 10, 2006.<sup>10</sup>

### **1. The October 10, 2006 Industry Relief Meeting**

Pursuant to the NPA Relief Planning Guidelines, NANPA distributed an Updated Planning Document (“PD”) to the Industry prior to the October 10 meeting. The PD contained descriptions, maps, general facts and assumptions, and the projected lives of three area code relief options, which consisted of two versions of a two-way area code split and one area code

---

<sup>7</sup> April 2007 NRUF and NPA Exhaust Analysis (“2007 NRUF Report”). The 2007 NRUF Report can be accessed on the NANPA web site at <http://www.nanpa.com>.

<sup>8</sup> The 760 NPA was originally declared to be in jeopardy on January 8, 1999 and has been subject to CO code rationing since then. A “jeopardy condition exists when the forecasted and/or actual demand for NXX resources will exceed the known supply during the planning/implementation interval for relief.” Central Office Code (NXX) Assignment Guidelines, § 9.3.1 (ATIS-0300051, Feb. 23, 2007) (“CO Code Assignment Guidelines”). The CO Code Assignment Guidelines can be accessed on the ATIS website located at [www.atis.org/docstore/default.aspx](http://www.atis.org/docstore/default.aspx). Following the declaration of jeopardy, the Industry meets and reaches consensus on CO code assignment rationing procedures.

<sup>9</sup> In order to plan for the introduction of new area codes, NANPA and the Industry utilize the NPA Code Relief Planning and Notification Guidelines (ATIS-0300061, Jan. 19, 2007) (“NPA Relief Planning Guidelines”). The NPA Relief Planning Guidelines assist NANPA, the Industry and regulatory authorities within a particular geographic NPA in the planning and execution of relief efforts. The NPA Relief Planning Guidelines can be accessed on the ATIS website located at [www.atis.org/docstore/default.aspx](http://www.atis.org/docstore/default.aspx).

<sup>10</sup> NANPA’s September 15, 2006 notification is attached as Exhibit A.

overlay. The Industry proposed an additional alternative for consideration at the October 10 meeting, identified as Alternative #4 below. The four relief options considered at the October 10 meeting include:<sup>11</sup>

- Alternative #1 – Geographic Split: The split boundary line generally follows the San Diego county line to the Mexico border. Specifically, the boundary runs east along the southern border of the Pinyon rate center, turns south along the western border of the Salton rate center and the eastern border of the Julian rate center to the Mexico border. There are 70 rate centers east and north of the split line, which is referred to as “Area A” in the PD. There are 14 rate centers west of the split line, which is referred to as “Area B” in the PD. This alternative keeps the cities and communities on both sides of the split line intact. Area A has a projected NPA life of 14 years to exhaust and Area B has a projected NPA life of 22 years to exhaust. This is the same geographic split previously adopted by the Commission in 1999.
- Alternative #2 – Geographic Split: The split boundary line follows the southern borders of the Pinyon and Indio rate centers, and continues along the eastern borders of the Calipatria, Brawley, and Holtville rate centers to the Mexico border. This split retains the rate centers in LATA 732 and also includes the Salton rate center, which is in LATA 973. There are 62 rate centers east and north of the split line, which is referred to as “Area A” in the PD. There are 22 rate centers west of the split line, which is referred to as “Area B” in the PD. The proposed split keeps the northern San Diego county and Imperial Valley together. It also keeps the cities and communities on both sides of the split line intact. Area A has a projected NPA life of 19 years to exhaust and Area B has a projected NPA life of 16 years to exhaust.
- Alternative #3 – All-Services Overlay: A new NPA code would be assigned to the same geographic area as the existing 760 NPA. This alternative has a projected life of 17 years.
- Alternative #4 – Geographic Split: The split boundary line follows the southern border of the Pinyon rate center, around the western, southern, and eastern borders of the Salton rate center, along the southern border of the Indio rate center, and continues along the eastern borders of the Calipatria, Brawley, and Holtville rate centers to the Mexico border. There are 63 rate centers east and north of the split line, which is referred to as “Area A” in the October 10 meeting minutes. There are 21 rate centers west of the split line, which is referred to as “Area B” in the October 10 meeting minutes. This split retains the rate centers in LATA 732 within one area code and keeps the northern San Diego County and Imperial Valley together. This alternative also keeps the cities and communities on both sides of the split line intact.

---

<sup>11</sup> The PD is included with NANPA’s September 15, 2006 Industry notice, which is attached as Exhibit A. The October 10 meeting minutes are attached as Exhibit B. The PD and October 10 meeting minutes contain further descriptions and illustrative maps of the alternatives considered by the Industry participants.

Area A has a projected NPA life of 18 years to exhaust and Area B has a projected NPA life of 16 years to exhaust.

The October 10 meeting attendees reviewed the attributes of the relief alternatives described above. The Industry reached consensus to recommend Alternative #3, the all-services distributed overlay plan, to the Commission as their choice of relief for the 760 NPA. A proposal was made and consensus reached to recommend Alternative #4 if the Commission decides to adopt a geographic split, rather than the recommended overlay, as the method of area code relief for the 760 NPA. It was noted that in the event the Commission decides to implement a geographic split, the Commission will need to decide which side of the split line will change to the new NPA. The Industry also reached consensus to present the overlay option and two of the area code split options (Alternative #1 and Alternative #4 above) to the public for comment during local jurisdiction and public participation meetings.

The Industry chose the all-services distributed overlay plan over the geographic split alternatives as the preferred method of relief because it would be quicker to implement than the geographic split alternatives and likely would be the least disruptive to customers.<sup>12</sup> Typically overlays do not require existing customers to change their telephone numbers and no cities or other communities of interest would be split by a new NPA boundary. The all-services distributed overlay also would treat all customers equally, unlike the geographic split alternatives, which would require some, but not all, customers to incur expenses associated with changing their telephone numbers. Further, an all-services distributed overlay would avoid negotiating which customers would change their telephone numbers. The Industry noted, however, that the overlay would subject customers to 1+10 digit dialing. Advertising and stationary listing only a 7-digit number would need to be changed by customers.

---

<sup>12</sup> See “General Attributes of Common Relief Alternatives,” attached to the PD, for a list of Industry agreed upon attributes of geographic splits and overlays.

In addition, the Industry noted that the geographic split depicted in Alternative #1 would have unbalanced NPA lives (a difference of eight years). The Industry further concluded that the proposed geographic split alternatives would result in additional technical complexity due to number porting. The Industry also eliminated some of the geographic split alternatives because the boundary lines would split LATAs or separate a rate center from its LATA. For example, Alternative #1 would split LATA 732, and Alternative #2 would split the Salton rate center from LATA 973. Alternative #4, the geographic split alternative endorsed by the Industry as its second choice, would keep the Salton rate center communities of interest with the Indio rate center and keep the relevant LATAs intact. However, Imperial County would be split and receive two area codes.

The Industry also reached consensus at the October 10 meeting to recommend a 13-month schedule for implementing the area code overlay, and a 15-month schedule for implementing an area code split in the event the Commission adopts Alternative #4. In addition, the Industry, in conjunction with the Commission staff, agreed to hold two local jurisdiction meetings and four public participation meetings to allow those affected by an area code change to voice their concerns and opinions.

## **2. The Local Jurisdiction And Public Participation Meetings**

A local jurisdiction meeting and a public participation meeting were held on February 5, 2007 in Apple Valley, California at the Apple Valley Town Hall Council Chambers. An additional public participation meeting was held the following day in Palm Springs, California at the City of Palm Springs City Council Chambers. A local jurisdiction meeting and a public participation meeting also were held on February 21, 2007 in Carlsbad, California at the City of Carlsbad - Faraday Building. Another public participation meeting was held the following day in El Centro, California at the El Centro City Council Chambers.

The local jurisdiction and public participation meetings were well attended by consumers representing business and residential interests and local officials. Attendees had an opportunity to discuss the proposed relief alternatives and express their preferences. The Commission also established other mechanisms for the public to express their views, either by sending comments and preferences to the Public Advisor's Office ("PAO") or the Commission via its website. A summary of the local jurisdiction and public participation meetings and other comments lodged with the PAO and Commission was compiled by the Commission's staff. The summary demonstrates that of more than 1300 public responses, 601 responses preferred the Alternative #1 geographic split, 163 responses preferred the Alternative #4 geographic split, and 261 responses preferred the Alternative #3 all-services overlay.<sup>13</sup>

### **3. The March 14, 2007 Industry Relief Meeting**

On March 5, 2007, NANPA notified the Industry that another relief meeting regarding the 760 NPA would be held March 14, 2007 to discuss the results of the local jurisdiction and public participation meetings and to finalize the Industry's recommendations to the Commission. The participants of the March 14, 2007 meeting discussed the attributes of the relief alternatives that were presented in the local jurisdiction and public participation meetings.<sup>14</sup> The Industry's consensus is to recommend Alternative #3, the all-services distributed overlay plan, to the Commission as their preferred means of relief for the 760 NPA. The Industry participants reiterated many, if not all, of the reasons voiced in the October 10, 2006 meeting regarding why an overlay was preferred to a geographic split.

---

<sup>13</sup> Further information regarding the local jurisdiction and public participation meetings and consumer comments is included in NANPA's March 5, 2007 letter notifying the Industry of a follow-up relief planning call scheduled for March 14, 2007. NANPA's March 5, 2007 notification is attached as Exhibit C.

<sup>14</sup> The March 14 meeting minutes are attached as Exhibit D.

In addition, the Industry participants reviewed selected points raised in the public participation meetings. The Industry noted that public participation meeting attendees generally expressed their preference to keep their 760 existing area code, and many assumed they would do so in the event of a split. Retaining the 760 area code seemed to be the primary concern voiced at the public participation meetings, rather than keeping 7-digit dialing. Several attendees also objected to a geographic split because they had changed area codes several times in the past. Finally, it was noted that Imperial County school district favored Alternative #1, one of the geographic split relief plans, because the school district believed that Alternative #4 would split part of the school district in the Salton rate center from the rest of the school district. Subsequent to the March 14 meeting, the Commission staff provided updated information regarding the total number of public responses, and for those public responses submitted via the Internet, a breakdown of the responses by city and individuals' comments. NANPA provided the updated information to the Industry on March 22, 2007.<sup>15</sup>

The Industry also reached consensus to recommend the geographic split option identified as Alternative #4 in the event the Commission adopts a geographic split rather than the recommended overlay.<sup>16</sup> It was noted that if the Commission adopts geographic split Alternative #4 as the form of relief for the 760 NPA, or one of the other alternatives presented above or a Commission-designed geographic split, the Commission must decide which side of the split to assign the new NPA.

---

<sup>15</sup> *See supra* n.17.

<sup>16</sup> Several Industry members expressed support for recommending exclusively the all-services distributed overlay, noting that an overlay best aligns with the views expressed at the local jurisdiction and public participation meetings.



#### **4. The April 18, 2007 Industry Relief Meeting**

The Commission staff subsequently released further, more detailed information regarding responses received from the public, including an updated summary of all public responses, and for those public responses submitted via the Internet, a breakdown of the responses by city and individuals' comments.<sup>17</sup> The Industry met again on April 18, 2007 to discuss the additional information provided by Commission staff.<sup>18</sup> Two telecommunications companies (Verizon California Inc. and AT&T) again expressed support for Alternative #3, the all-services distributed overlay plan, as their preferred means of relief for the 760 NPA because an overlay would not require customers to change their telephone numbers, would preserve local municipality boundaries, and would be a non-discriminatory and competitively neutral form of area code relief. One company (Cox Communications) also stated it does not support an overlay and supports a geographic split if the 760 NPA remains on the western edge of the 760 NPA's existing geographic area.

#### **5. The May 16, 2007 Industry Relief Meeting**

The Industry held a follow-up relief planning meeting on May 16, 2007.<sup>19</sup> AT&T, Verizon and Verizon Wireless noted that additional technical issues are presented when implementing a geographic split rather than an overlay. Specifically, it is their view that it is more difficult to comply with local number portability requirements in an area where a geographic split is implemented. Prior to initiating permissive dialing, the Number Portability Administration Center (which houses all ported and pooled numbers) and carriers must update various databases and systems with new and old NPAs and CO Codes to ensure that port

---

<sup>17</sup> NANPA provided the Industry with this additional information on March 22, 2007, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit E.

<sup>18</sup> The April 18 meeting minutes are attached as Exhibit F.

<sup>19</sup> The May 16 meeting minutes are attached as Exhibit G.

requests are fulfilled in a timely manner. Otherwise, calls will be misrouted or denied. Cox Communications and Citizens/Frontier, noting that consumers appear to prefer a geographic split over an overlay, reiterated their support of a geographic split that retains the 760 NPA on the San Diego County side (*i.e.*, western side) of the split line.

## **II. DESCRIPTION OF THE RECOMMENDED RELIEF ALTERNATIVES**

The recommended all-services distributed overlay, Alternative #3, would superimpose a new NPA (the 442 NPA) over the same geographic area covered by the existing 760 NPA. All existing customers would retain the 760 area code and would not have to change their telephone numbers. Consistent with FCC regulations and California uniform dialing, the relief plan would require 1+10 digit dialing for all calls within and between the 760 NPA and the new NPA.<sup>20</sup> All calls (local and toll), whether the calls are to the home NPA or a foreign NPA, would be dialed using 1+10 digits (wireless customers could dial 10 or 1+10 digits for all calls). CO code assignments would be made from the new overlay area code beginning one month after mandatory dialing.

The Industry's two-way geographic split alternative, Alternative #4, would split the 760 NPA into two NPAs. One NPA would cover the southwestern region of the existing 760 NPA and include 21 rate centers. The other NPA would cover the northern and eastern regions of the existing 760 NPA and include 63 rate centers. The geographic split would require customers located within the area receiving the new area code to change their telephone numbers. Customers would continue using seven digit local dialing for local and toll calls within their home NPA. Local calls placed between the two area codes would require 1+10 digit dialing. All toll calls to a foreign NPA would be dialed using 1+10 digits.

---

<sup>20</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 52.19(c)(3)(ii).

Industry participants reached consensus to recommend to the Commission a 13-month schedule for implementing the all-services distributed overlay including a customer education program (attached as Exhibit H), and a 15-month schedule for implementing the geographic split. The schedules, provided below, include recommended intervals for each implementation phase, which are dependent upon the Commission's adoption of either the recommended overlay or geographic split, respectively, as the means of relief for the 760 NPA.

#### **Recommended Implementation Schedule For An All-Services Distributed Overlay**

<b>EVENT</b>	<b>TIMEFRAME</b>
Start of Customer Education and Network Preparation Period	6 months
Start of Permissive 1+10 Digit Dialing and Continue Customer Education Period ( <i>i.e.</i> , calls within the 760 NPA can be dialed using 7 or 1+10 digits) Mandatory Dialing Period begins at the end of the Permissive Dialing Period	6 months
First Code Activation ( <i>i.e.</i> , effective date for CO codes from the new overlay NPA)	1 month
Total Implementation Interval	13 months

#### **Recommended Implementation Schedule For A Two-Way Geographic Split**

<b>EVENT</b>	<b>TIMEFRAME</b>
Start of Customer Notification and Network Preparation Period	6 months
Continued Distribution of Customer Notices and Permissive Dialing Period Mandatory Dialing Period begins at the end of the Permissive Dialing Period	6 months
Mandatory Dialing and Recorded Announcement Period	3 month
Total Implementation Interval	15 months

Adhering to either of the proposed implementation schedules will avoid the denial or delay of service to telecommunications providers' customers due to the unavailability of CO codes.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

The Industry respectfully requests that the Commission issue an order approving the Industry's choice for relief for the 760 NPA, an all-services distributed overlay depicted in Alternative #3, or if the Commission adopts a geographic split, the two-way geographic split depicted in Alternative #4 above. The Industry also requests that the order approve the recommended relief implementation schedule that relates to the type of relief adopted by the Commission to ensure the quickest implementation of relief possible and facilitate customer education.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kimberly Wheeler Miller  
Kimberly Wheeler Miller  
NeuStar, Inc.  
2000 M Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 533-2912  
(202) 533-2972  
[kimberly.miller@neustar.biz](mailto:kimberly.miller@neustar.biz)

Joseph R. Cocke  
Senior NPA Relief Planner  
North American Numbering Plan Administrator  
NeuStar, Inc.  
1445 Los Angeles Ave., Suite 301-N  
Simi Valley, CA 93065  
(805) 520-1945  
[Joe.Cocke@neustar.biz](mailto:Joe.Cocke@neustar.biz)

June 18, 2007

## VERIFICATION

I, Gerald J. Kovach, hereby state the following under penalty of perjury. I am Senior Vice President, External Affairs for NeuStar, Inc., the North American Numbering Plan Administrator ("NANPA"), in its role as the neutral third party NPA Relief Planner for California under the North American Numbering Plan and on behalf of the California telecommunications industry. I am authorized to make this verification on NANPA's behalf. I have read the foregoing "Application of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator, on behalf of the California Telecommunications Industry, for Relief of the 760 Numbering Plan Area" (the "Application"). To the best of my personal knowledge, except as to the matters which are therein stated on information or belief, based on personal information and communications with and information provided by appropriate NANPA personnel, I believe the facts stated in the Application to be true and correct.

By: /s/ Gerald J. Kovach  
Gerald J. Kovach

Date: June 18, 2007

## **ATTACHMENT 1**

### **COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 2.1(c)**

In compliance with Rule 2.1(c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, NeuStar, Inc., the North American Numbering Plan Administrator, in its role as the neutral third party NPA Relief Planner for California under the North American Numbering Plan and on behalf of the California telecommunications industry ("Industry"), provides the following information:

**Proposed Category:** The Application should be categorized as a ratesetting proceeding according to Rule 6.1(c) which states in part "[w]hen a proceeding does not clearly fit into any of the categories as defined in Rules 1.3(a), (d), and (e), the proceeding will be conducted under the rules applicable to the ratesetting category" unless otherwise determined by the Commission.

**Need for Hearings:** The Application does not raise any material issues of fact. Further, as explained in the Application, local jurisdiction and public participation hearings have been held regarding the issues presented in the Application. Accordingly, hearings are not required.

**Issues to be Considered:** Whether the Commission should adopt the Industry's recommended all-services distributed overlay, with corresponding 13-month implementation schedule, as the preferred form of relief for the 760 numbering plan area ("NPA").

**Proposed Schedule:** NANPA projects that the 760 NPA is will exhaust during the third quarter of 2009. As explained in the Application, the Industry recommends a 13-month schedule to implement the all-services distributed overlay. To ensure the Industry has sufficient time to implement relief before the 760 NPA expires, the following schedule is proposed:

Application Filed	June 18, 2007
Expiration of Protest Period	July 18, 2007
Decision Issued	September 17, 2007

**Before the  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF CALIFORNIA  
San Francisco, California 94102**

---

Application of the North American Numbering  
Plan Administrator, on behalf of the California  
Telecommunications Industry, for Relief of the  
760 Numbering Plan Area

---

)  
)  
) Docket No. \_\_\_\_\_  
)  
)  
)  
)

**NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY**

In accordance with Rule 1.9(c) of the California Public Utility Commission Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, NeuStar, Inc., the North American Numbering Plan Administrator ("NANPA"), serves this Notice of Availability in lieu of its Application for Relief of the 760 Numbering Plan Area ("Application") filed with the Commission on June 18, 2007. NANPA, in its role as the neutral third party Numbering Plan Area ("NPA") Relief Planner for California under the North American Numbering Plan and on behalf of the California telecommunications industry ("Industry"), requests in the Application that the Commission approve an all-services distributed overlay as the preferred form of relief for the 760 NPA. The Industry also reached consensus to recommend a two-way geographic split, described as Alternative #4 in the Application, if the Commission decides to adopt a geographic split rather than the recommended overlay.

In support of the request, the Application includes: (1) the verification of Gerald J. Kovach in support of the Application; (2) several exhibits containing information about various NPA relief alternatives, the Industry's consideration of those alternatives, and a summary of local jurisdiction and public participation meetings that were held regarding relief for the 760 NPA; and (3) other information required by the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

A copy of the Application and its supporting documents will be served at the request of any party receiving this Notice of Availability.

Requests for a copy of the Application and its supporting documents should be made to Joseph R. Cocke at (805) 520-1945 or Joe.Cocke@neustar.biz.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kimberly Wheeler Miller  
Kimberly Wheeler Miller  
Director, Regulatory Law & Public Policy  
NeuStar, Inc.  
2000 M Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 533-2912 (office)  
(202) 533-2972 (fax)  
Kimberly.Miller@neustar.biz

Joseph R. Cocke  
Senior NPA Relief Planner  
North American Numbering Plan Administrator  
NeuStar, Inc.  
1445 Los Angeles Ave., Suite 301-N  
Simi Valley, CA 93065  
(805) 520-1945  
Joe.Cocke@neustar.biz

June 18, 2007



Docket Office  
**PROOF OF SERVICE**<sup>1</sup>

I, Kimberly Wheeler Miller, the undersigned, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am over the age of 18 years. I am employed by NeuStar, Inc. in the City of Washington, D.C.
2. My business address is 2000 M St., NW, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
3. On June 18, 2007, at 2000 M St., NW, Washington, D.C. by 5:00p.m., I served a true copy of the attached document titled exactly:

**NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY**

4. A true copy of said document was placed in a sealed envelope, addressed, affixed with a First-Class Stamp and hand delivered to a United States Postal Service for delivery to those parties on the attached service list.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 18<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2007, at Washington, D.C.

/s/ Kimberly Wheeler Miller  
Kimberly Wheeler Miller

---

<sup>1</sup> This service list is comprised of: (1) the contact names for the companies that hold central office codes or blocks in the 760 NPA that are listed in NANPA's database for industry numbering contacts; and (2) the cities and counties in the 760 NPA.

Valerie Endlich  
Cricket Communications, Inc./  
Alaska Native Broadband  
10307 Pacific Center Court  
San Diego, CA 92121

Mike Belmont  
Broadwing Communications  
200 N. LaSalle St.  
Chicago, IL 60601

Mark Burns  
Arch Wireless Operating Company Inc.  
3000 Technology Dr.  
Plano, TX 75074

Penny Compton  
Mpower Communications  
3300 N. Cimarron Rd.  
Las Vegas, NV 89129

Karla Gallenberger  
Global Crossing Local Services, Inc.  
2737 S. Ridge Rd.  
Green Bay, WI 54304

Leslie Miklos  
Level 3 Communications  
Managing Numbering Administration  
121 Champion Way  
Canonsburg, PA 15317

Sandra Gore  
Cox Communications  
1400 Lake Hearn Dr.  
Atlanta, GA 30319

Michael Hess  
Commpartners  
3291 N. Buffalo Dr., Suite 150  
Las Vegas, NV 89129

Russell Jancic  
Network Services LLC  
525 S. Douglas St.  
El Segundo, CA 90245

Marcy Baxter  
AT&T  
One AT&T Way  
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Marlon Brown  
XO Communications  
2637 Summit Ave.  
Plano, TX 75023

Micki Burton  
AT&T  
525 Market St.  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2727

Joanne Edelman  
Verizon Wireless  
2785 Mitchell Drive MS 8-1  
Walnut Creek, CA 94598

George Guerra  
AT&T  
3475B North 1<sup>st</sup> St. – Room 500  
San Jose, CA 95134

Debra Gooden  
Verizon Business  
2400 North Glenville  
Richardson, TX 75082

Alexandra Hanson  
01 Communications  
1515 K St., Suite 100  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Weston Jackert  
Cingular  
1741 Loma Vista St.  
Pasadena, CA 91104

Paula Jordan  
T-Mobile  
2380 Bisso Lane, Suite A  
Concord, CA 94520

Lorraine Kocen  
Verizon California Inc.  
112 S. Lakeview Canyon Rd.  
Thousands Oaks, CA 91362

Todd Lesser  
North County Communications Corp.  
3802 Rosecrans St.  
San Diego, CA 92110

Patrick Maroney  
Sprint Nextel  
6330 Sprint Parkway  
Overland Park, KS 66251-6102

Kevin Neilan  
Cook Telecom, Inc.  
9833-B Pacific Heights Blvd.  
San Diego, CA 92121

Tom Pease  
Time Warner Telecom  
5700 S. Quebec St.  
Greenwood Village, CO 80111

Linda Roller  
Ponderosa Telephone  
P. O. Box 21  
O'Neals, CA 93645

Matanane Jose  
Fort Mojave Telecommunications, Inc.  
8490 S Highway 95, Suite 104  
Mohave, Valley, AZ 86440

Jami Perez  
Pac West Telecom  
4217 Coronado Ave.  
Stockton, CA 95204

Vic Jackson  
Silver Strand Enterprises  
2377 Seminole Dr.  
Okemos, MI 48864

Barbara Lainson  
Paetec Communications  
One Paetec Plaza  
Fairport, NY 14450

Lynn Goodroe  
American Messaging Services, LLC  
1720 Lakepointe Dr.  
Lewisville, TX 75057

Maureen Matthews  
Telscape Communications, Inc.  
606 E. Huntington Dr.  
Monrovia, CA 91016

Marc O'Krent  
Telephone Connection Local Services, LLC  
9911 W. Pico Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Alex Ponnath  
Integrated Communications Consultants Inc.  
333 Washington Blvd.  
Marina Del Rey, CA 90292

Michael Schelin  
Shelcomm  
14160 Live Oak Ave.  
Baldwin Park, CA 91706

Ian Lawson  
Accessible Wireless, LLC  
100 Via De La Valle, Suite 200  
Del Mar, CA 92014

Steve Hamilton  
Digitcom Services, Inc.  
5280 E. Beverly Blvd., Suite C, PMB 274  
Los Angeles, CA 90022

John Klass  
Pacific Centrex  
6855 Tujunga Ave.  
North Hollywood, CA 91605

Peter Dickson  
SBC Internet Services  
157 Green St.  
Foxboro, ME 02035-2868

Dennis Rose  
Telekenex c/o CHRsolutions  
3721 Executive Center Dr., Suite 200  
Austin, TX 78731

Anne Chism  
TDS Telecom  
525 Junction Road  
Madison, WI 53717

Jerome Candelaria  
California Cable &  
Telecommunications Assoc.  
360 22nd St., Suite 750  
Oakland, CA 94612

Adilia Aguilar  
NTCH  
703 Pier Ave., Suite B (PMB #813)  
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254

Stacie Houghton  
CBeyond Communications  
320 Interstate N. Parkway  
Atlanta, GA 30339

Michael Evans  
California Public Utilities Commission  
Communications Division  
505 Van Ness Ave., Area 3-D  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298

City Clerk  
City of Brawley  
400 Main Street  
Brawley, CA 92227

City Clerk  
City of California City  
21000 Hacienda Blvd.  
California City, CA 93505

Holly Kuester  
CC Fiberlink, LLC  
12405 Powerscourt Dr.  
St. Louis, MO 63131

Jena Downs  
Verizon.  
99 Shawan Road  
Cockeysville, MD 21030

Elissa McOmber  
Frontier  
180 S. Clinton Ave.  
Rochester, NY 14646

Brian Murdoch  
KMC Data, LLC  
1755 North Brown Road  
Lawrenceville, GA 30043

Brenda Summerlin  
ALLTEL Communications, Inc.  
One Allied Drive, B2F03-B  
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203

Maribeth A. Bushey  
California Public Utilities Commission  
Administrative Law Judge Division  
505 Van Ness Ave, RM 5018  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298

Cherrie Conner  
California Public Utilities Commission  
Communications Division  
505 Van Ness Ave., Area 3-D  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298

City Clerk  
City of Calexico  
608 Heber Avenue  
Calexico, CA 92231

City Clerk  
City of Ridgecrest  
100 W. California Avenue  
Ridgecrest, CA 93555

City Clerk  
City of Barstow  
220 East Mountain View Street, Suite A  
Barstow, CA 92311

City Clerk  
Town of Mammoth Lakes  
P.O. Box 1609  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

City Clerk  
City of Calipatria  
125 Park Street  
Calipatria, CA 92233

County Clerk  
Imperial County Board of Supervisors  
940 Main Street  
El Centro, CA 92243

County Clerk  
Inyo County Board of Supervisors  
168 N. Edwards Street  
Independence, CA 93526

County Clerk  
Riverside County Board of Supervisors  
4080 Lemon Street – 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Riverside, CA 92501

County Clerk  
San Diego County Board of Supervisors  
County Administration Center  
1600 Pacific Highway  
San Diego, CA 92101

City Clerk  
City of Westmorland  
355 South Center Street  
P.O. Box 699  
Westmorland, CA 92281

City Clerk  
City of Bishop  
377 West Line Street  
P.O. Box 1236  
Bishop, CA 93515

City Clerk  
City of Imperial  
420 S. Imperial Avenue  
Imperial, CA 92251

City Clerk  
City of Holtville  
121 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street  
Holtville, CA 92250

County Clerk  
Kern County Board of Supervisors  
1115 Truxton Avenue, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Bakersfield, CA 93301

County Clerk  
Mono County Board of Supervisors  
P.O. Box 237  
Bridgeport, CA 93517

County Clerk  
San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors  
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue – 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92415 - 0110

City Clerk  
City of El Centro  
1275 Main Street  
El Centro, CA 92243

City Clerk  
City of Blythe  
235 N. Broadway  
Blythe, CA 92225

City Clerk  
Cathedral City  
68700 Avenida Lalo Guerro  
Cathedral City, CA 92234

City Clerk  
City of Coachella  
1515 6<sup>th</sup> Street  
Coachella, CA 92236

City Clerk  
City of Desert Hot Springs  
65950 Pierson Blvd.  
Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240

City Clerk  
City of Indian Wells  
44-950 Eldorado Drive  
Indian Wells, CA 92210 - 7497

City Clerk  
City of Indio  
100 Civic Center Mall  
Indio, CA 92201

City Clerk  
City of Palm Desert  
73-510 Fred Waring Drive  
Palm Desert, CA 92260

City Clerk  
City of La Quinta  
P.O. Box 1504  
La Quinta, CA 92247-1504

City Clerk  
City of Palm Springs  
3200 East Tahquitz Canyon Way  
Palm Springs, CA 92262

City Clerk  
City of Rancho Mirage  
69-825 Highway 111  
Rancho Mirage, CA 92270

City Clerk  
City of Adelanto  
11600 Air Expressway  
Adelanto, CA 92301

City Clerk  
Town of Apple Valley  
14955 Dale Evans Parkway  
Apple Valley, CA 92307

City Clerk  
City of Barstow  
220 East Mountain View Street, Suite A  
Barstow, CA 92311

City Clerk  
City of Hesperia  
9700 Seventh Avenue  
Hesperia, CA 92345

City Clerk  
City of Needles  
817 Third Street  
Needles, CA 92363

City Clerk  
City of Twentynine Palms  
6136 Adobe Road  
Twentynine Palms, CA 92277

City Clerk  
City of Carlsbad  
1200 Carlsbad Village  
Carlsbad, CA 92008

City Clerk  
City of Encinitas  
505 S. Vulcan Avenue  
Encinitas, CA 92024

City Clerk  
Town of Yucca Valley  
57090 Twentynine Palms Highway  
Yucca Valley, CA 92284

City Clerk  
City of Oceanside  
300 North Coast Highway  
Oceanside, CA 92054

City Clerk  
City of Vista  
600 E. Eucalyptus Avenue  
Vista, CA 92084

City Clerk  
City of Victorville  
14343 Civic Drive  
P.O. Box 5001  
Victorville, CA 92392

City Clerk  
City of Escondido  
201 North Broadway  
Escondido, CA 92025-2798

City Clerk  
City of San Marcos  
One Civic Center Drive  
San Marcos, CA 92069